



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/535,029 | 05/12/2005 | Junichiro Watanabe | 2002JP310 | 9127 |
| 26289 | 7590 | 02/16/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| AZ ELECTRONIC MATERIALS USA CORP. ATTENTION: INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY DEPT. 70 MEISTER AVENUE SOMERVILLE, NJ 08876 | | | ZIMMER, MARC S | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1712 | |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | 02/16/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/535,029 | WATANABE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Marc S. Zimmer | 1712 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8,9,11 and 12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 7 and 10 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/09/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Claim Analysis

Applicant is advised that the Examiner considers the entire preamble to be nothing more than an intended-use recitation. Section 2112.02 of the MPEP provides direction as to how phrases such as this are to be treated: "If the body of a claim fully and intrinsically sets forth all of the limitations of the claimed invention, and the preamble merely states, for example, the purpose or intended use of the invention, rather than any distinct definition of any of the claimed invention's limitations, then the preamble is not considered a limitation and is of no significance to claim construction."

Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165 (Fed. Cir. 1999). See also *Rowe v. Dror*, 112 F.3d 473, 478, 42 USPQ2d 1550, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("where a patentee defines a structurally complete invention in the claim body and uses the preamble only to state a purpose or intended use for the invention, the preamble is not a claim limitation"); *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d at 152, 88 USPQ2d at 480-81 (preamble is not a limitation where claim is directed to a product and the preamble merely recites a property inherent in an old product defined by the remainder of the claim). For the purpose of evaluating the patentability of claim 1, it will be treated as a polymer compound claim and the preamble will be assessed no patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okawa, U.S.

Patent # 5,169,920. See the examples and comparative examples. The polymers provided therein have a stoichiometry and number average molecular weight that are consistent with a polydimethyldiphenylsiloxane having between 1 and 40 repeat units of each type.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., U.S. Patent # 5,604,039. See column 2 wherein a dimethyldiphenylsiloxane copolymer is portrayed. It is contemplated that there may be between 1 and 300 of each of the dimethylsiloxane and diphenylsiloxane. Embodiments wherein there are 40 or less of each type of repeat unit are obvious in view of this disclosure.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030232279. Choi discloses a negative resist composition comprising an alkali soluble resin bearing epoxy groups, an organosilicon crosslinker, and a photoacid generator (paragraph 9). Exemplary of the composition is that which is described in paragraph 50. Relevant to

the present discussion, the composition described in claim 50 includes a hydroxyl group-terminated polydimethyldiphenylsiloxane having a viscosity of 60 centistokes. The reported viscosity is consistent a copolymer having the number of repeat units designated by the claims.

There is, however, no mention of a photosensitizer. Nevertheless, the incorporation of a photosensitizer as a means of extending the serviceable wavelength band for a given photoacid generator is obvious. "It is prima facie obvious to add a known ingredient to a known composition for its known function." *In re Lindner* 173 USPQ 356; *In re Dial et al* 140 USPQ 244.

The resist composition is coated onto a silicon wafer that has been treated (coated) with hexamethyldisilazane, cured, and then developed with tetramethylammonium hydroxide (paragraphs 51 and 52).

Concerning claims 5 and 6, glass is an obvious alternative to silicon wafers as a substrate for semiconductor manufacture.

It is appreciated that *Choi* does not antedate the submission date of the foreign priority application. Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15. Were Applicant to furnish a certified translation of these papers, the would be withdrawn provided that they provided proper support for all of the limitations of the rejected claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As an aside, it should be mentioned that the prior art is replete with references that make at least cursory mention of the employment of siloxane polymers as leveling agents though in most instances the identity or structures of said polymers is not volunteered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc S. Zimmer whose telephone number is 571-272-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

February 13, 2007

Marc S. Zimmer
MARC S. ZIMMER
PRIMARY EXAMINER